

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE:

CARLOS BRITO,

Plaintiff,

V.

SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC,
SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, DADELAND
NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC
D/B/A CANTON SUSHI MAKI
DADELAND, and HJK PARTNERS, INC.
D/B/A SMOOTHIE KING #79,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated mobility-impaired individuals (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), sues SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC, SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC D/B/A CANTON SUSHI MAKI DADELAND, and HJK PARTNERS, INC. D/B/A SMOOTHIE KING #79 (hereinafter "Defendants"), and as grounds alleges:

JURISDICTION PARTIES, AND VENUE

1. This is an action for injunctive relief, a declaration of rights, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*, (the "Americans with Disabilities Act" or "ADA") and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

2. The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiffs claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.* pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a).

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and may render declaratory judgment on the existence or nonexistence of any right under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, *et seq.*

4. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, is an individual over eighteen years of age, with a residence in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and is otherwise *sui Juris*.

5. At all times material, Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC and SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, owned and operated a commercial shopping center located at 6605 S Dixie Hwy, Miami, Florida 33143 (hereinafter the "Commercial Property") and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC and SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, hold themselves out to the public as "Dadeland North Shopping Center."

6. At all times material, Defendant, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, organized under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida.

7. At all times material, Defendant, SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Miami Lakes, Florida.

8. At all times material, Defendant, DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC, owned and operated a commercial restaurant located at 6661 S Dixie Hwy Miami, Florida 33143¹ (hereinafter the "Commercial Property") and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Defendant, DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC, holds itself out to the public as "Canton Sushi Maki Dadeland."

9. At all times material, Defendant, DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company, incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Medley, Florida.

10. At all times material, Defendant, HJK PARTNERS, INC., was and is a Florida For-Profit Corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of Florida, with its principal place of business in Miami, Florida.

11. At all times material, Defendant, HJK PARTNERS, INC., owned and operated a commercial restaurant located at 6637 S Dixie Hwy Miami, Florida 33143² (hereinafter the "Commercial Property") and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Miami-Dade County, Florida. Defendant, HJK PARTNERS, INC., holds itself out to the public as "Smoothie King #79."

12. Venue is properly located in the Southern District of Florida because Defendants' Commercial Property is located in Miami-Dade County, Florida, Defendants regularly conduct business within Miami-Dade County, Florida, and because a substantial part(s) of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

13. Although nearly thirty (30) years have passed since the effective date of Title III of the ADA, Defendants have yet to make its facilities accessible to individuals with disabilities.

14. Congress provided commercial businesses one and a half years to implement the Act. The effective date was January 26, 1992. In spite of this abundant lead-time and the extensive publicity the ADA has received since 1990, Defendants continue to discriminate against people who are disabled in ways that block them from access and use of Defendants' businesses and properties.

15. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in 28 CFR 36.201 and requires landlords and tenants to be liable for compliance.

16. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, is an individual with disabilities as defined by and pursuant to the ADA. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, is, among other things, a paraplegic (paralyzed from his T-6 vertebrae down) and is therefore substantially limited in major life activities due to his impairment, including, but not limited to, not being able to walk or stand. Plaintiff requires the use of a wheelchair to ambulate.

17. Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC and SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, own, operate and/or oversee the Commercial Property, its general parking lot/or and parking spots specific to the businesses therein, located in Miami, Florida, that is the subject of this Action.

18. Defendants, DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC and HJK PARTNERS, INC., own, operate and/or oversee their businesses, located within the Defendant's Commercial Property, located in Miami, Florida, that is the subject of this Action.

19. Mr. Brito is a staunch advocate of the ADA. Since becoming aware of his rights, and their repeated infringement, he has dedicated much of his life to this cause so that he, and others like him, may have full and equal enjoyment of public accommodations without the fear of discrimination and repeated exposure to architectural barriers in violation of the ADA.

20. He is often frustrated and disheartened by the repetitiveness of the complaints he is forced to make to employees and management at different places of public accommodation over thirty (30) years after the legislation of the ADA, to no avail. Mr. Brito is accordingly of the belief that the only way to affect change is through the mechanisms provided under the ADA.

21. The individual Plaintiff visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, to include a visit to the Commercial Property and businesses

located within the Commercial Property on or about November 01, 2022 and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and enjoy the Commercial Property and businesses located therein. He often visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered there, and because it is approximately seven (7) miles from his residence, and is near other businesses and restaurants he frequents as a patron. He plans to return to the Commercial Property and the businesses located within the Commercial Property within two (2) months of the filing of this Complaint, in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered at the place of public accommodation and check if it has been remediated of the ADA violations he encountered.

22. The Plaintiff found the Commercial Property, and the businesses located within the Commercial Property to be rife with ADA violations. The Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property and wishes to continue his patronage and use of each of the premises.

23. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers that are in violation of the ADA at the subject Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property. The barriers to access at the Commercial Property, and the businesses located within the Commercial Property have each denied or diminished Plaintiffs ability to visit the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, and have endangered his safety in violation of the ADA. The barriers to access, which are set forth below, have likewise posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, and others similarly situated.

24. Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC, SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC,

DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC, and HJK PARTNERS, INC., own and/or operate a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC, SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC, and HJK PARTNERS, INC., are responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC, SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC, and HJK PARTNERS, INC., own and operate the Commercial Property Business located at 6605 S Dixie Hwy, Miami, Florida 33143.

25. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property and the businesses located within the Commercial Property, including but not necessarily limited to the allegations in Counts I through III of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and businesses located therein, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property are in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

26. Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC and SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, as landlords and owners of the Commercial Property, are responsible for all ADA violations listed in Counts I through III.

27. Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, but not necessarily limited to the allegations in Counts I through III of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, and businesses within the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and businesses within the Commercial Property, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property are in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

28. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Commercial Property, and businesses located within the Commercial Property, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.

COUNT I- ADA VIOLATIONS
AS TO SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC and SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC

29. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1

through 28 above as though fully set forth herein.

30. Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC and SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC, have discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Parking

- i. The plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking spaces are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking spaces located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking space access aisles are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking space access aisles located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Entrance Access and Path of Travel

- i. The plaintiff had difficulty using some of the curb ramps, as the slopes are excessive. Violation: There are curb ramps at the facility that contain excessive slopes, violating Section 4.7.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 405.2 and 406.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- ii. The plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it is not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes from the public sidewalk and transportation stop. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(1), 4.3.8, 4.5.1, and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.1, 302.1, 303, and 402.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel due to abrupt changes in level. Violation: There are vertical changes in levels of greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ inch, violating Sections 4.3.8 and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 303 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

COUNT II - ADA VIOLATIONS
AS TO SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC, SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC and
DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC

31. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 28 above as though fully set forth herein.

32. Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC, SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC and DADELAND NORTH SUSHI AND CHINESE LLC, have discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Public Restrooms

- i. The plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering

clearance was not provided due to the location of a trashcan. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance due to a lack of maintenance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- ii. The plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance is not provided. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The restroom signage is not mounted at the required location, violating Section 4.30.6 of the ADAAG and Section 703.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

COUNT III - ADA VIOLATIONS
AS TO SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC,
SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC and HJK PARTNERS, INC.

33. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 28 above as though fully set forth herein.

34. Defendants, SOUTH FLORIDA RESIDENTIAL LLC, SIXTY SEVEN US 1, LLC and HJK PARTNERS, INC., have discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of

\$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Public Restrooms

- i. The plaintiff had difficulty using the locking mechanism on the restroom door without assistance, as it requires tight grasping. Violation: The restroom door has non-compliant hardware for disabled patrons, violating Sections 4.13.9 & 4.27.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4 & 404.2.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance was not provided due to the location of a trashcan. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance due to a lack of maintenance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The plaintiff was exposed to a cutting/burning hazard because the lavatory pipes are not wrapped. Violation: The lavatory pipes are not fully wrapped or maintained violating Section 4.19.4 of the ADAAG and Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as a trashcan obstructs the clear floor space. Violation: The required clear floor space is not provided next to the toilet, violating Section 4.16.2 & Figure 28 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and 604.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The plaintiff could not flush the toilet without assistance, as the flush valve is not mounted on the wide area. Violation: The flush valve is not mounted on the compliant side in violation of Section 4.16.5 of the ADAAG and Section 604.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- vi. The plaintiff had difficulty using the toilet without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required distance from the side wall. Violation: The water closet is mounted at a non-compliant distance from the side wall, violating Section 4.16.2 and Figure 28 of the ADAAG and Section 604.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as objects are mounted less than 1½" below a grab bar obstructing its use. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Sections 4.16.4 & 4.26.2 of the ADAAG and Section and 609.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- viii. The plaintiff had difficulty using the toilet paper due to the roll not being located within a dispenser. Violation: Elements in the restroom are not readily accessible and usable by persons with disabilities, violating 28 CFR 36.211, whose resolution is readily achievable.

RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE BASIS

35. The discriminatory violations described in Counts I through III are not an exclusive list of the Defendants' ADA violations. Plaintiff requests an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and barriers to access in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff further requests to inspect any and all barriers to access that were concealed by virtue of the barriers' presence, which prevented Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, from further ingress, use, and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Business and businesses located within the Commercial Property; Plaintiff requests to be physically present at such inspection in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a

remediation plan to address Plaintiffs request for injunctive relief. The remediations for the ADA violations listed herein are readily achievable.

36. The individual Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities privileges, benefits, programs and activities offered by Defendants, Defendants' buildings, businesses and facilities; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendants because of the Defendants' ADA violations as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, The Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiffs request for injunctive relief.

37. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its place of public accommodation or commercial facility, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Furthermore, Defendants continue to discriminate against Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no

individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

38. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, will suffer irreparable harm, and has a clear legal right to the relief sought. Further, injunctive relief will serve the public interest and all those similarly situated to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

39. Defendants are required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for their place of public accommodation. The Plaintiff and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, The Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

40. Notice to Defendants is not required as a result of the Defendants' failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff or waived by the Defendant.

41. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to alter the property where Defendants operate their businesses, located at and/or within the commercial property located at 6661 S Dixie Hwy Miami,

Florida 33143, the exterior areas, and the common exterior areas of the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property, to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to The Plaintiff and all other mobility-impaired persons; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendants cure the violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, The Plaintiff, CARLOS BRITO, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue (i) a Declaratory Judgment determining Defendants at the commencement of the subject lawsuit were and are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.; (ii) Injunctive relief against Defendants including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facilities; or to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require Defendants to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services; (iii) An award of attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and (iv) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: December 9, 2022.

GARCIA-MENOCAL & PEREZ, P.L.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

350 Sevilla Avenue, Suite 200

Coral Gables, Fl 33134

Telephone: (305) 553-3464

Facsimile: (305) 553-3031

Primary E-Mail: ajperez@lawgmp.com

Secondary E-Mails: bvirues@lawgmp.com &

dperaza@lawgmp.com

By: /s/Anthony J. Perez

ANTHONY J. PEREZ

Florida Bar No.: 535451

BEYERLY VIRUES

Florida Bar No.: 123713